

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

Meeting Minutes

April 28, 2005

1. Call to Order.

Chair Alfano called the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meeting to order at 7:44 p.m. A quorum was not initially present, so the order of agenda items was changed to allow the meeting to proceed; however a quorum was achieved several minutes later.

Members Attending:

David Alfano, Michael Barnes, Cathy Baylock, Maureen Brooks, Robert Cronin, Karyl Matsumoto, Mike Harding, Ken Ibarra, Sue Lempert, Mark Meadows, and Cory Roay.

Staff/Guests Attending:

Geoff Kline and Walter Martone - C/CAG Staff. Guests were Mike Nelson of the Peninsula Bicycle and Pedestrian Coalition, Stan Workman of the City of Foster City, and Christine Maley-Grubl and Daniel Zurfluh of the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance, hereafter referred to as Alliance.

2. Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda.

Guest Mike Nelson spoke of the San Mateo Bay Meadows project and the problems he sees with it. The Peninsula Bicycle and Pedestrian Coalition is against the proposed plan because the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) as specified will become a "car slum". He encouraged San Mateo to have bicycles travel on Delaware Street. He stated the current plan can be greatly improved, and a diagram from the base plan can be taken off the website.

At this point, discussion was stopped because it possibly could have violated the Brown Act. It was agreed that the issue will be agendized for a future BPAC meeting.

Cory Roay, new public member from Daly City, was introduced and welcomed to BPAC. He replaced Colleen Jordan, who resigned from BPAC because of too many other commitments.

8. Bike to Work Day (taken out of order).

Christine Maley-Grubl of the Alliance was introduced to speak about the upcoming Bike to Work Day to be held May 19, 2005. She, in turn, introduced Daniel Zurfluh who provided handouts and described the activities during Bike to Work Day. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has contracted with the Regional Bike Coalition to conduct the event.

There will be a total of twenty (20) energizer stations throughout San Mateo County, primarily along the CALTRAIN route and including a new station in Foster City, which will have tables to provide "giveaways" such as bicycle maps, blinking lights, tire patch kits, food, and water in musette bags. There will also be workshops to promote bicycling to be held in San Bruno, San Carlos, and Redwood City with \$500 gift certificates given away to a few lucky participants.

Member Lempert stated that the Alliance should work through San Mateo County Chambers of Commerce for the dissemination of Bike to Work Day information.

3. Minutes of February 17 and 24, 2005 meetings.

The minutes of February 17, 2005 need to be revised in the third sentence of the third paragraph under Member Communications. The change should read, "Member Brooks stated that evidence of the acknowledgement" both sets of minutes were then approved.

Motion: Member Baylock moved/Barnes seconded approval of the minutes with the amendments to the February 17, 2005 minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

6. Results of CMAQ Regional Bicycle Program at MTC (taken out of order).

MTC has approved one (1) of the three (3) projects submitted from San Mateo County for Federal Regional Bicycle Program funds, which are actually Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. The Daly City project – Lake Merced Boulevard bike lanes: estimate \$537,000 – will receive funding. Projects from Millbrae and Belmont were not chosen for funding.

4. TDA Article #3 Project Status and Final Ranking.

A properly approved resolution from Menlo Park needs to be concluded no later than May 24, 2005, or else Menlo Park's three (3) projects, totaling \$60,000 will revert to San Mateo County Project #11. Note: This issue has been resolved in favor of Menlo Park.

With the CMAQ funding approved for Daly City Project #4-1, all projects will be fully funded through #21 on the priority list, and San Mateo County Project #11 will be partially funded in the amount \$80,509. This will use all Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article #3 bicycle and pedestrian funding (\$1,324,548) for San Mateo County projects in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-2006. This includes seven (7) pedestrian projects, the lack of which had been a matter of previous concern.

Motion: Member Baylock moved/Brooks seconded approval of the final ranking of TDA Article #3 projects for 2005-2006. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Critique TDA Article #3 Scoring and Ranking Process.

Chair Alfano was pleased with the number of applications received, and stated it was the best application cycle ever. He commented that project plans were complete. His only negative was that the video requirement in the application should not be required. Note: Member Lancelle echoed dropping the video requirement in comments received prior to the meeting.

A staff suggestion limiting the number of applications per jurisdiction was rejected by Member Baylock, who does not like limiting jurisdictions. She stated that a shortened application for those projects with less than an unspecified funds requested amount would be preferable. Member Meadows commented that a shortened application form would hurt jurisdictions because of a loss of project information needed to evaluate the project.

General discussion from BPAC members elicited the generally held opinion that the five (5) minute video should be used only as part of a jurisdiction's project presentation to BPAC. During the presentation, any information regarding the project may be introduced. Graphics are always a good way to show what is being considered.

Member Lempert was concerned with the duplication of some of the questions on the application. She suggested that the "State of Readiness" section should be organized in a simpler form. There is a necessity for providing a paragraph regarding the project and what is to be accomplished. Thus, there needs to be more space set aside for the project description.

The "Community Support" section also needs revision, and this section should be completed by staff so there is more continuity in the answers between applications. What is a "recognized pedestrian plan"? Guidelines should be developed for pedestrian projects. Member Barnes stated that the pedestrian projects submitted for the TDA Article #3 application cycle did not add any new projects. Solicitation should be made for new trails and new sidewalks.

7. Bicycle Map Status Report.

Member Brooks stated that digital information is coming in to be used in mapping. She hopes to have data collection finished by the end of June 2005. Currently, information is lacking for northern portions of San Mateo County. She is encouraging any suggestion to help the process. Send any response to her e-mail address.

Ideas from BPAC included:

- Develop points of contact for different geographical areas of the County.
- The Geographic Information System (GIS) specialist at San Mateo County Public Works Department, Adam Lodge, can key in traffic data and slopes along bicycle routes.
- Digital and printed maps showing all San Mateo County can be put on the Internet.
- C/CAG should own all data, something that is expected to occur.

Member Harding stated that he has biked on unfamiliar routes shown on the existing bike map, which he cites as being a good one. Member Meadows stated that the new map should be laminated for wet weather use. BPAC acknowledged Maureen Brooks for her hard work on this activity.

9. Countywide Pedestrian Plan.

A first draft of a Countywide Pedestrian Plan (CPP) was taken from Chapter 16 of the Countywide Transportation Plan. BPAC directed staff to keep building on this plan. Also it was suggested to submit the plan to each jurisdiction to develop representative projects from accompanying pedestrian project guidelines.

10. TDA Article #3 Project Pictures on C/CAG Website.

Oral report was accepted as presented.

11. Countywide Bicycle Plan Project Sponsors.

Sponsors for Projects #1 - #15 were presented. Project #15 deals with the San Francisco Bay Trail transiting the property of San Francisco International Airport (SFO). It was brought out to concentrate on avoiding SFO altogether and find other gaps in the Bay Trail.

12. Public Member Extensions and Replacement.

This item sparked lots of comments regarding how to choose public members of BPAC. Member Lempert stated that elected officials should know who public members are and what they bring to BPAC. Commenting on the summary of remarks from the C/CAG Board meeting of April 2005, she said that there needs to be a formal way to evaluate prospective public members. This is especially important since Joe Silva of Colma is her apparent successor when she leaves BPAC in November 2005.

Member Lempert continued that a better geographical distribution, or geography balance of representatives within San Mateo County – South, Mid-County, North, and Coast – should occur. She also espoused the idea that there should only be two (2) people per city or jurisdiction. The issue of residence jurisdiction versus location of employment was raised. Member Brooks stated that the locations of home versus job site is not important as a qualifying criterion of BPAC membership.

Chair Alfano stated how he came to be appointed to BPAC. He participated in a competitive process to become an alternate member. He was required to send a letter to be considered for the position. He continued that BPAC now has very active public members who have worked hard to develop a very good bicycle advisory committee. He finished by stating that a so-called “quota system” based on geography must be avoided.

Member Baylock pointed out that elected officials rely on public members for bicycle information. She stated that BPAC should not be politicized, and that public members are objective, and do not engage in “power” struggles. She also stated that too much rigidity regarding location will hurt BPAC. Member Meadows pointed out that riding around San Mateo County is most important for familiarity with bicycle issues.

Regarding past voting problems, Member Matsumoto pointed out how some members came to BPAC meetings only to vote on projects receiving funding, which is sometimes skewed adversely by absentees. She stated that a member must be present to vote. She also pointed out that northern San Mateo County jurisdictions are getting better at receiving funding for projects.

Member Baylock stated that the objective should be to find the best people without being concerned with where they are located. However, they must have good attendance. Member Ibarra pointed out that public members have an interest in serving on BPAC. Member Meadows stated there would be a definite problem if all public members had to recompetete for designated positions. Member Lancelle, in a call to Geoff Kline, opted for having a subcommittee of elected officials develop a public membership policy.

Member Lempert stated her feeling that there is a need for a questionnaire for public members.

Boards and commission members usually have terms of four (4) years and must be reappointed. She agreed that public members are not political, but there is a need for some type of balance. She stated that there has always been the assumption that committee members are appointed based on where each lives.

Chair Alfano pointed out that the safeguard for BPAC is requiring a minimum of four (4) elected members to reach a quorum. Member Lempert said she would prepare a draft of a sample questionnaire. Member Baylock reiterated that qualifications are most important.

Discussion concluded with Member Ibarra stating that there should be some type of review process, because those in authority should assess all factors regarding membership. Member Lempert felt officials should solicit for new public members for every term. It seemed to be decided that the C/CAG Board should assess membership factors and decide who should serve.

13. Member Communications.

The issue of the Half Moon Bay TDA Article #3 extension will be heard at the next meeting.

The next meeting is to be June 23, 2005.

14. Adjournment

The meeting ended at 9:46 p.m.